arXiv:1607.08369v1 [math.LO] 28 Jul 2016

Probabilistic logic of quantum observations

A. Sernadas[1] J. Rasga[1] C. Sernadas[1] L. Alcácer[2] A.B. Henriques[3]

[1] Dep. Matemática, Instituto Superior Técnico
and
Centro de Matemática, Aplicações Fundamentais e Investigação Operacional

[2] Dep. de Engenharia Química, Instituto Superior Técnico
and
Instituto de Telecomunicações

[3] Dep. Física, Instituto Superior Técnico
and
Centro Multidisciplinar de Astrofísica

Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

2016-07-25 15:08:05

Abstract

A probabilistic propositional logic, endowed with an epistemic component, is presented and illustrated for reasoning about the random results of projective measurements made on a given quantum state. A sound and weakly complete axiomatization is provided. The proposed logic is proved to be a conservative extension of classical propositional logic.

Keywords: quantum logic, probabilistic logic, epistemic logic.

AMS MSC2010: 03G12, 81P10, 03B48.

1 Introduction

The origin of quantum logic can be traced back to John von Neumann's 1932 paper (see [vN55]). Since then, the question of reasoning in logic about quantum phenomena has been a recurrent research topic.

The introduction of quantum mechanics concepts in formal logic is quite challenging since there is the need to accommodate the continuous nature of quantum mechanics within the discrete setting of symbolic reasoning.

There are two main approaches to quantum logic. In the original approach, proposed in the seminal paper [BvN36], the connectives in classical

propositional logic are replaced by new quantum connectives reflecting the operations in the lattice of all closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. The other approach, followed in [vdMP03, MS06] focus on extensions of classical propositional logics with new constructions for reasoning about particular quantum mechanics notions (inspired by the way probabilistic reasoning was introduced in classical logic [Hal03, SRS15]) and keeping the classical connectives. For an overview of quantum logic and quantum structures, see [EGL07, EGL09].

In this paper, we adopt the latter approach to quantum logic and generalize the work in [MS06], by reasoning about incompatibility of observables (in [MS06] all observables were assumed to be compatible). This was achieved by defining an epistemic-like operator $\odot\,\alpha$ with the intended meaning *it is possible to know the truth value of propositional formula* α. Moreover, we address the problem of reasoning about the random results of projective measurements made on a given quantum state. So, a more general semantics than the one in [MS06] had to be defined as well as a different calculus. More precisely, we develop a conservative extension of classical propositional logic (PLQO) where each propositional symbol is an assertion on the result of a measurement (mathematically described by an observable) of a certain physical quantity and a classical formula is a Boolean assertion on the possible results of the measurements associated with its propositional symbols.

In Section 2, we briefly review some basic mathematical concepts of quantum mechanics, introduce the notion of propositional quantum variable and analyze compatibility of propositional quantum variables. After that, in Section 3, we introduce the language of PLQO after recalling some notions of classical propositional logic as well as of the theory of real closed ordered fields. This language has two kinds of atomic formulas: $\odot\,\alpha$ as referred above, and $\int\alpha\,@\,p$ with the intended meaning of *it is possible to know the truth value of* α and *the probability of* α *being true is* $@p$ where $@ \in \{=, <\}$. Then, we introduce the notion of quantum interpretation structure which is composed by a Hilbert space representing the envisaged quantum system, a unit vector representing the quantum state and the interpretation of each propositional symbol as a propositional quantum variable. Satisfaction and entailment are then defined. The section ends by presenting an axiomatization for PLQO capitalizing on the decidability of the theory of real closed ordered fields. This axiomatization is shown to be strongly sound in Section 4 after establishing some auxiliary results. In Section 5, we show that the axiomatization is weakly complete starting by proving a finite-dimensional model existence lemma relating satisfaction of a formula in PLQO with satisfaction of the translation of the formula in the RCOF

interpretation structure having as domain the set $\mathbb{R}$. Strong completeness is out of question since PLQO is not a compact logic as we explain in Section 3. Conservativeness of PLQO with respect to classical propositional logic is discussed in Section 6. Finally, in Section 7, we investigate the epistemic nature of observability and provide several examples. We conclude the paper in Section 8 with the global assessment of what was done and future research directions.

2 Preliminaries

Our objective here is to provide a very brief account of what we need to know about the random results of projective measurements made on a quantum state. For a full account see [Hal13].

Propositional quantum variables

Following the mathematical formulation of quantum mechanics, as introduced by Dirac in 1930, [Dir67], and by von Neumann in 1932, [vN55], a quantum system is defined by a complex separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and a quantum state of the system is represented by a unit vector $|\psi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}$.[1]

A projective measurement is specified by a self-adjoint operator (aka observable) acting on $\mathcal{H}$. The possible results of the measurement are the values in the spectrum Ω of the observable. Clearly, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ since the operator is self-adjoint. The result of performing the measurement on a quantum state is random, as we proceed to explain.

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the σ-field of the Borel subsets of Ω induced by the usual topology of $\mathbb{R}$. The spectral theorem tells us that an observable O induces

[1] We follow the Dirac notation (or the bra-ket notation), see [Dir39, Hal13]: A vector ψ in $\mathcal{H}$ is referred to as a *ket* and is denoted $|\psi\rangle$, and, for any ϕ in $\mathcal{H}$, $\langle\phi|$, referred to as a *bra*, denotes the linear functional such that

$$\langle\phi|(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\phi|\psi\rangle$$

where $\langle\phi|\psi\rangle$ is the inner product of ϕ with ψ. Moreover, given an operator A on $\mathcal{H}$ and a vector ϕ in $\mathcal{H}$, we denote by $\langle\phi|A$ the linear map such that

$$\langle\phi|A(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\phi|A|\psi\rangle$$

where $\langle\phi|A|\psi\rangle$ is $\langle\phi|A\psi\rangle$. Finally, for any ψ, ϕ in $\mathcal{H}$, $|\psi\rangle\langle\phi|$ denotes the linear operator on $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\phi|(|\chi\rangle) = \langle\phi|\chi\rangle|\psi\rangle.$$

a projection-valued measure ν mapping each $S \in \mathfrak{B}$ to an orthogonal projection (aka projector) $\nu(S)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \omega \, d\nu(\omega) = O.$$

Henceforth we denote each $\nu(S)$ by Proj_S and its range by $\mathcal{H}_S$ (a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}$). The projection-valued measure $\nu : S \mapsto \mathrm{Proj}_S$ enjoys the following properties.

- $\mathrm{Proj}_\emptyset = 0$ and $\mathrm{Proj}_\Omega = I$.
- Given a countable family $\{S_j\}_{j\in J}$ of pairwise disjoint elements of $\mathfrak{B}$, let
$$S = \bigcup_{j\in J} S_j.$$
Then,
$$\mathrm{Proj}_S|\xi\rangle = \sum_{j\in J} \mathrm{Proj}_{S_j}|\xi\rangle$$
for every $|\xi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.
- For every $S_1, S_2 \in \mathfrak{B}$,
$$\mathrm{Proj}_{S_1\cap S_2} = \mathrm{Proj}_{S_1}\mathrm{Proj}_{S_2}.$$

Observe that if $S_1, S_2 \in \mathfrak{B}$ are disjoint, then $\mathrm{Proj}_{S_1}\mathrm{Proj}_{S_2} = 0$ and, so, $\mathcal{H}_{S_1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{S_2}$ are perpendicular. Furthermore, for arbitrary $S_1, S_2 \in \mathfrak{B}$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_1\cap S_2} = \mathcal{H}_{S_1} \cap \mathcal{H}_{S_1}.$$

If the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ is finite, then every observable has a finite spectrum composed of its eigenvalues. Moreover, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathcal{H}_{\{\omega\}}$ is the eigenspace associated to ω.

An observable O and a state $|\psi\rangle$ induce the probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}, \mu_{|\psi\rangle})$ where:

- Ω is the set of outcomes (spectral values of O);
- $\mathfrak{B}$ is the σ-field of events (measurable sets of outcomes);
- $\mu_{|\psi\rangle}$ is the probability measure
$$S \mapsto \langle\psi|\mathrm{Proj}_S|\psi\rangle : \mathfrak{B} \to [0,1].$$

The probability of obtaining a result in S by performing the measurement specified by O on $|\psi\rangle$ is $\mu_{|\psi\rangle}(S)$.

The observable tells us all we need to know about the measurement results when its spectrum is countable. Otherwise, we need an additional ingredient reflecting the fact that measurements cannot be made with infinite precision.

By a *quantum variable* we mean a pair $Y = (O, \mathcal{D})$ where O is an observable acting on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a countable partition of Ω such that $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathfrak{B}$. We say that Y is defined on $\mathcal{H}$ and takes values in $\mathcal{D}$. For each spectral value ω, we write D_ω for the element of the partition $\mathcal{D}$ to which ω belongs.

Such a quantum variable $Y = (O, \mathcal{D})$ and a state $|\psi\rangle$ induce the random variable

$$Y_{|\psi\rangle} = \omega \mapsto D_\omega : \Omega \to \mathcal{D}$$

on $(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}, \mu_{|\psi\rangle})$. Moreover, the probability distribution induced by $Y_{|\psi\rangle}$ on $\mathcal{D}$ is as follows:

$$D \mapsto \mathsf{Prob}\left(Y_{|\psi\rangle} = D\right) = \mu_{|\psi\rangle}(D) : \mathcal{D} \to [0, 1].$$

For the purpose of this paper and, in general, for applications in quantum computation, logic and information, we are specially interested in quantum variables that can take only two values, say $\uparrow$ (true) and $\downarrow$ (false).

Accordingly, by a *propositional quantum variable* (in short *pqv*), we mean a quantum variable $Y = (O, \mathcal{D})$ such that $\mathcal{D} = \{\uparrow, \uparrow^{\mathsf{c}}\}$. So, a pqv is completely specified by providing the observable O and the set $\uparrow \in \mathfrak{B}$ of *distinguished spectral values*. For this reason, from now on we say that a pqv is pair $(O, \uparrow)$ such that O is an observable and $\uparrow \in \mathfrak{B}$. We may write $\downarrow$ for $\uparrow^{\mathsf{c}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ for $\mathcal{H}_\uparrow$. Clearly, the probability of pqv Y being true is given by

$$\mathsf{Prob}\left(Y_{|\psi\rangle} = \uparrow\right) = \mu_{|\psi\rangle}(\uparrow).$$

For a closer look at the notion of pqv we make use of the complete orthomodular lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of the closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ in which the partial order ($\sqsubseteq$) is set inclusion, the meet ($\sqcap$) is set intersection and the join ($\sqcup$) is the closure of the linear span of set union. The lattice is bounded, with the trivial Hilbert space $\{|0\rangle\}$ as bottom and $\mathcal{H}$ as top. Observe that $\mathcal{H} \neq \{|0\rangle\}$ because $\mathcal{H}$ was assumed to be separable. Clearly, the elements of the lattice are Hilbert spaces. Moreover, they are all separable with the exception of $\{|0\rangle\}$. Given $H \in \mathcal{L}$, we denote by Proj_H the projector onto H.

Given a pqv $Y = (O, \uparrow)$, we can define the bounded observable

$$\widetilde{O} = \mathrm{Proj}_\uparrow.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\Omega} = \{0, 1\}$ with $\mathcal{H}_{\{1\}} = \mathcal{H}_{\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\{0\}} = \mathcal{H}_{\downarrow}$. Thus, Y induces the pqv

$$\widetilde{Y} = (\widetilde{O}, \widetilde{\uparrow}).$$

where $\widetilde{\uparrow} = \{1\}$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$\mathsf{Prob}\left(\widetilde{Y}_{|\psi\rangle} = \widetilde{\uparrow}\right) = \mathsf{Prob}\left(Y_{|\psi\rangle} = \uparrow\right)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{Y}} = \mathcal{H}_{Y}.$$

Conversely, given an $H \in \mathcal{L}$, we define the pqv

$$\mathcal{Y}^{H} = (\mathrm{Proj}_{H}, \{1\}).$$

Thus,

$$\widetilde{Y} = \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{H}_{\uparrow}}.$$

and, so,

$$\mathsf{Prob}\left(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{H}_{\uparrow}}_{|\psi\rangle} = \widetilde{\uparrow}\right) = \mathsf{Prob}\left(Y_{|\psi\rangle} = \uparrow\right).$$

In conclusion, for the purpose of computing the probabilities of the results of a single measurement, there is an equivalence between the notions of pqv and closed subspace. In other words, we can look at a pqv as being either an observable together with a measurable set of distinguished spectral values or as a closed subspace. We next address what happens when one wants to perform several simultaneous measurements on a given state of the quantum system.

Compatibility of propositional quantum variables

The theory of quantum mechanics tells us that it is possible to make two measurements simultaneously on a given state only if their observables are compatible. Moreover, it tells us that two observables are compatible if and only if they commute. We proceed now with the task of bringing the notion of compatibility to the realm of propositional quantum variables.

Given pqvs $Y' = (O', \uparrow')$ and $Y'' = (O'', \uparrow'')$, we say that they are *compatible* if the induced observables $\widetilde{O}'$ and $\widetilde{O}''$ commute.

It is straightforward to verify that if O' and O'' commute then Y' and Y'' are compatible. However, it is easy to find trivial examples illustrating that the converse does not hold in general. It is enough, for instance, to take non commuting observables with the empty set as one of the distinguished

sets. But it is worthwhile to present a non-trivial example. Let O' and O'' be the position and the momentum, respectively, of a particle freely moving in one dimension. Recall that these two observables do not commute and that $\Omega' = \Omega'' = \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\uparrow' = \uparrow'' = \left\{ z\sqrt{2\pi} : z \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Then, by Theorem 5 in [BHL07], $\widetilde{O}'$ and $\widetilde{O}''$ commute. We shall see similar examples in Section 7.

If a pair of quantum variables is incompatible, then we cannot use them simultaneously for observing the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ in hand. In other words, if Y' and Y'' are incompatible, then it makes no sense to consider the joint probability distribution

$$\langle D', D'' \rangle \mapsto \mathsf{Prob}\left(\langle Y'_{|\psi\rangle}, Y''_{|\psi\rangle} \rangle = \langle D', D'' \rangle \right) : \mathcal{D}' \times \mathcal{D}'' \to [0,1]$$

where, recall, $\mathcal{D}' = \{\uparrow', \downarrow'\}$ and $\mathcal{D}'' = \{\uparrow'', \downarrow''\}$. This fact will have an enormous impact on the nature of the envisaged logic. Namely, it is at the heart of the need for an epistemic component in the logic. Actually, this is the key difference between observing a probabilistic system and observing a state of a quantum system.

On the other hand, if the pair of quantum variables is compatible, then it is perfectly legitimate to consider the joint probability distribution of the random variables induced by them and the state $|\psi\rangle$ in hand. Furthermore, for each $\langle D', D'' \rangle \in \mathcal{D}' \times \mathcal{D}''$,

$$\mathsf{Prob}\left(\langle Y'_{|\psi\rangle}, Y''_{|\psi\rangle} \rangle = \langle D', D'' \rangle \right) = \mu_{|\psi\rangle}(D' \cap D'') = \langle \psi | \mathrm{Proj}_{D' \cap D''} | \psi \rangle.$$

It is worth mentioning that

$$\mathrm{Proj}_{D' \cap D''} = \mathrm{Proj}_{D'} \mathrm{Proj}_{D''} = \mathrm{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}_{D'} \sqcap \mathcal{H}_{D''}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{D' \cap D''} = \mathcal{H}_{D'} \sqcap \mathcal{H}_{D''}.$$

For a better understanding of the notion of compatibility between pqvs, it is worthwhile to review how it is reflected in the corresponding elements of $\mathcal{L}$.

To this end, first recall that, for any $H', H'' \in \mathcal{L}$, the following conditions are equivalent [Pir76]:

1. The sublattice generated by $\{H', (H')^{\perp}, H'', (H'')^{\perp}\}$ is distributive.

2. $(H' \sqcap H'') \sqcup (H'^{\perp} \sqcap H'') \sqcup (H' \sqcap H''^{\perp}) \sqcup (H'^{\perp} \sqcap H''^{\perp}) = \mathcal{H}$.

3. $(H' \sqcap H'') \sqcup (H'^{\perp} \sqcap H'') = H''$.

4. $(H' \sqcup H''^{\perp}) \sqcap H'' = H' \sqcap H''$.

Recall also that such H' and H'' are said to be *compatible* if condition 1 holds.

By making use of the equivalences above, it is straightforward to prove that pqvs Y' and Y'' are compatible if and only if the induced closed subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{Y'}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{Y''}$ are compatible. Conversely, closed subspaces H' and H'' are compatible if and only if the induced pqvs $\mathcal{Y}^{H'}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{H''}$ are compatible.

In conclusion, for the purpose of checking compatibility, there is an equivalence between the notions of pqv and closed subspace. In other words, also for this purpose, we can look at a pqv as being either an observable together with a measurable set of distinguished spectral values or as a closed subspace.

As expected, we say that a set of quantum variables is *incompatible* if it contains (at least) an incompatible pair. Otherwise, the set is said to be *compatible*. Clearly, the empty set is compatible and so is each singleton set. Moreover, every superset of an incompatible set of quantum variables is also incompatible.

3 Language, semantics and calculi

The objective of this section is to define an enrichment of classical propositional logic (CPL) to reason about the random results of simultaneously applying observables to a given quantum state.

The idea is to add as little as possible to the classical propositional language. To this end, we add a constructor for expressing that (the truth value of) a (classical) formula representing an assertion on the results of simultaneous measurements is knowable and a symbolic construct for constraining the probability of such a formula.

Concerning CPL we need to adopt some notation and review some concepts and facts.

Let L_{c} be the classical language built with the propositional symbols in $B = \{B_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and with $\mathtt{tt}$ (verum), using the connectives $\neg$ (negation) and $\supset$ (implication). The other connectives as well as $\mathtt{ff}$ (falsum) are introduced as abbreviations. Concerning non-primitive connectives, we use $\wedge$

(conjunction), $\vee$ (disjunction) and $\equiv$ (equivalence) in the paper. It becomes handy to use B_α for the set of propositional symbols that occur in a formula α.

Recall that a valuation (on A) is a map $v : A \to \{0,1\}$ where $A \subseteq B$. Given a valuation $v : A \to \{0,1\}$ and $A' \subseteq A$ we denote by $v|_{A'}$ the restricton of v to A'. We use $v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$ for stating that valuation $v : A \to \{0,1\}$, with $B_\alpha \subseteq A$, satisfies formula α and $\Delta \models_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$ for stating that Δ classically entails α. One says that α is a tautology if $\models_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$.

Given a valuation v on $A \subseteq B$ and $B_j \in A$, we denote by

$$v^{B_j \leftarrow d}$$

the valuation such that

$$v^{B_j \leftarrow d}(B_i) = \begin{cases} v(B_i) & \text{if } i \neq j \\ d & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A propositional symbol B_j is said to be *essential* for a formula α whenever $B_j \in B_\alpha$ and there exists a valuation v on B_α such that

$$v^{B_j \leftarrow 0} \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad v^{B_j \leftarrow 1} \nVdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha.$$

We denote by

$$eB_\alpha$$

the set of essential propositional symbols for α. Observe that eB_α contains only the propositional symbols that contribute in an essential way to the truth value of α. Clearly, $eB_\alpha \subseteq B_\alpha$. Moreover, α is a tautology if and only if $eB_\alpha = \emptyset$. That is, the truth values of the propositional symbols in $B \setminus eB_\alpha$ are irrelevant for determining the truth value of α. The set eB_α can be effectively calculated by finding the algebraic normal form of α and considering its propositional symbols (all of them essential). For more details on algorithms for obtaining the algebraic normal form see [Zhe27, SP07].

Before proceeding with the presentation of the envisaged probabilistic logic of quantum observations PLQO, we need to adopt some notation and review some facts concerning also the first-order theory of real closed ordered fields (RCOF), having in mind the use of its terms for denoting probabilities and other quantities.

Recall that the first-order signature of RCOF contains the constants 0 and 1, the unary function symbol $-$, the binary function symbols $+$ and $\times$, and the binary predicate symbols $=$ and $<$. We take the set

$$X = X_{\mathbb{N}} \cup X_{L_{\mathsf{c}}} \cup \{x_{A'} : A' \subseteq B, |A'| = 2\},$$

where $X_{\mathbb{N}} = \{x_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $X_{L_{\mathsf{c}}} = \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}\}$, as the set of variables. By $T^{\circ}_{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ we mean the set of terms in RCOF that do not use variables in $X_{L_{\mathsf{c}}} \cup \{x_{A'} : A' \subseteq B, |A'| = 2\}$ while T_{RCOF} denotes the set of all terms. As we shall see, the variables in $X_{L_{\mathsf{c}}}$ become handy as fresh variables in the proposed axiomatization PLQO, for representing within the language of RCOF the probability of α being true. On the other hand, the variables in $\{x_{A'} : A' \subseteq B, |A'| = 2\}$ are used for representing whether or not the observables associated with the propositional symbols in A' are compatible.

As usual, we may write $t_1 \leq t_2$ for $(t_1 < t_2) \vee (t_1 = t_2)$, $t_1\, t_2$ for $t_1 \times t_2$ and t^n for

$$\underbrace{t \times \cdots \times t}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

Furthermore, we also use the following abbreviations for any given $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

- m for $\underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_{\text{addition of } m \text{ units}}$;
- m^{-1} for the unique z such that $m \times z = 1$;
- $\dfrac{n}{m}$ for $m^{-1} \times n$.

The last two abbreviations might be extended to other terms, but we need them only for numerals. We do not notationally distinguish, for the sake of a lighter style, between a natural number and the corresponding numeral and between each predicate symbol and its denotation.

In order to avoid confusion with the other notions of satisfaction used herein, we adopt $\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}}$ for denoting satisfaction in first-order logic (over the language of RCOF).

Recall also that the theory RCOF is decidable [Tar51]. This fact will be put to good use in the axiomatization for PLQO (presented at the end of this section). Furthermore, every model of RCOF satisfies a formula in the RCOF language if and only the formula is a theorem of RCOF (Corollary 3.3.16 in [Mar02]). We shall take advantage of this result in the semantics of PLQO for adopting the ordered field $\mathbb{R}$ of the real numbers as the model of RCOF.

Language

The language L_{PLQO} of the probabilistic logic of quantum observations PLQO is inductively defined as follows:

- $\odot\,\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$ whenever $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$;
- $\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$ whenever $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$, $p \in T^{\circ}_{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ and $@ \in \{=, <\}$;
- $\varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2 \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$ whenever $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$.

Propositional abbreviations can be introduced as usual. For instance,

$$\neg\,\varphi \;\text{ for }\; \varphi \supset (\textstyle\int \mathbb{tt} < 1)$$

and similarly for $\wedge$, $\vee$ and $\equiv$. Comparison abbreviations also become handy. For instance,

$$\textstyle\int\alpha \leq p \;\text{ for }\; (\int\alpha = p) \vee (\int\alpha < p)$$

and

$$\textstyle\int\alpha \geq p \;\text{ for }\; \neg(\int\alpha < p).$$

Semantics

Given a term t in T_{RCOF} and an assignment $\rho : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we write $t^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$ for the denotation of term t in $\mathbb{R}$ for ρ. When t does not contain variables we may use $t^{\mathbb{R}}$ for the denotation of t in $\mathbb{R}$.

By a *quantum interpretation structure* (in short, *quantum structure*) we mean a triple

$$I = (\mathcal{H}, |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$$

where:

- $\mathcal{H}$ is a complex separable Hilbert space;
- $|\psi\rangle$ is a unit vector in $\mathcal{H}$;
- $B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j$ is a map that associates to each propositional symbol B_j a propositional quantum variable $\underline{B}_j = (O_j, \mathcal{D}_j)$ defined on $\mathcal{H}$.

Let $I = (\mathcal{H}, |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$ be a quantum structure, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D_j \in \mathcal{D}_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Observe that, given an orthonormal basis U of $\mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathrm{Proj}_{D_k} \ldots \mathrm{Proj}_{D_1} |\psi\rangle$$

is the vector

$$\sum_{\substack{|u\rangle \in U \\ j = 1, \ldots, k \\ O_j|u\rangle = \lambda_j|u\rangle \\ \lambda_j \in D_j}} \langle\psi|u\rangle|u\rangle.$$

In the sequel, given $A \subseteq B$ and a valuation $v : A \to \{0,1\}$, let

$$D^v_{B_j} = \begin{cases} \uparrow_j & \text{if } v(B_j) = 1 \\ \downarrow_j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for each $B_j \in A$. Therefore, we are taking $\uparrow$ as true and $\downarrow$ as false.

A quantum structure I assigns a probability to any formula $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$ as follows:

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \mathsf{Prob}\left(\langle (\underline{B}_{j_1})_{|\psi\rangle}, \ldots, (\underline{B}_{j_k})_{|\psi\rangle}\rangle = \langle D^v_{B_{j_1}}, \ldots, D^v_{B_{j_k}}\rangle\right)$$

assuming that $B_\alpha = \{B_{j_1}, \ldots, B_{j_k}\}$. We prove in Section 4 that Prob_I is indeed a *probability assignment* (see [Ada98, SRS15]), that is, a map P on L_{c} satisfying the following (Adams) principles:

P1 $0 \leq P(\alpha) \leq 1$;

P2 If $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$ then $P(\alpha) = 1$;

P3 If $\alpha \vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta$ then $P(\alpha) \leq P(\beta)$;

P4 If $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\beta \wedge \alpha)$ then $P(\beta \vee \alpha) = P(\beta) + P(\alpha)$.

As we proceed to explain, a quantum structure I tells us, among other things, which are the knowable classical formulas in the sense that they do not involve incompatible sets of quantum variables.

Given $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$, let $\underline{\alpha} = \{\underline{B}_j : B_j \in eB_\alpha\}$. We say that α is an *I-observable formula* if $\underline{\alpha}$ is a compatible set of propositional quantum variables. Observe that only the essential propositional symbols are relevant.

Given a quantum structure I and an assignment $\rho : X \to \mathbb{R}$, *satisfaction of formulas* by I and ρ is inductively defined as follows:

- $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha$ whenever α is I-observable;
- $I\rho \Vdash \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$ whenever $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha$ and $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) \mathbin{@} p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$;
- $I\rho \Vdash \varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2$ whenever $I\rho \nVdash \varphi_1$ or $I\rho \Vdash \varphi_2$.

We may omit the reference to the assignment ρ whenever the PLQO formula in hand does not include variables. For examples illustrating satisfaction, see Section 7.

Let $\Gamma \subseteq L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$ and $\varphi \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$. We say that Γ *entails* φ, written $\Gamma \vDash \varphi$, whenever, for every quantum structure I and assignment ρ, if $I\rho \Vdash \gamma$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ then $I\rho \Vdash \varphi$. As expected, φ is said to be *valid* when $\vDash \varphi$.

Observe that entailment in PLQO is not compact. Indeed, since $\mathbb{R}$ is Archimedean and $\odot B_1$ is valid,

$$\left\{ \int B_1 \leq \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \vDash \int B_1 = 0.$$

However, there is no finite subset Ψ of $\{\int B_1 \leq \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that

$$\Psi \vDash \int B_1 = 0.$$

Calculus

The PLQO calculus combines propositional reasoning with RCOF reasoning. We intend to use the RCOF reasoning to a minimum, namely to prove assertions like

$$(\beta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta_k) \supset \beta$$

where $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k, \beta$ are PLQO literals. To this end, we need to introduce some preliminary material. Given $U \subseteq A \subseteq B$ where A is finite, we use the abbreviation

$$\phi_A^U \quad \text{for} \quad \left(\bigwedge_{B_j \in U} B_j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{B_j \in A \setminus U} \neg\, B_j \right),$$

when $A \neq \emptyset$, and, for $\mathtt{tt}$, otherwise. Note that each classical formula ϕ_A^U identifies the valuation on A that assigns true to the propositional symbols in U and assigns false to the propositional symbols in $A \setminus U$.

Given a finite set $A \subseteq B$, we denote by

$$Q_{\odot}^{A}$$

the RCOF formula

$$\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq A \\ |A'| = 2}} x_{A'} = 0,$$

and given a set $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$ of propositional formulas with propositional symbols in A, we denote by

$$Q^{A,\Delta}$$

the RCOF formula

$$\left(\bigwedge_{U\subseteq A} 0 \leq x_{\phi_A^U} \leq 1\right) \wedge \left(\sum_{U\subseteq A} x_{\phi_A^U} = 1\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\substack{A'\subseteq A\\ U'\subseteq A'}} x_{\phi_{A'}^{U'}} = \sum_{\substack{U\subseteq A\\ U\cap A' = U'}} x_{\phi_A^U}\right) \wedge$$

$$\left(\bigwedge_{\substack{A'\subseteq A\\ |A'|=2}} x_{A'} \geq 0\right) \wedge$$

$$\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} x_{\alpha_i} = \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_{\alpha_i}\to\{0,1\}\\ v\Vdash_{\mathsf{c}}\alpha_i}} x_{\phi_{B_{\alpha_i}}^{\{B_j\in B_{\alpha_i}:v(B_j)=1\}}}\right).$$

We proceed to explain the meaning of each conjunct of formula $Q^{A,\Delta}$. The idea is that each variable x_α represents the probability of α being true in a particular quantum structure which, according to the definition, is the sum of the probabilities of obtaining the results induced by the valuations that satisfy α when performing the measurements associated with the formula. When α is ϕ_A^U there is a unique valuation on A that satisfies α and so we can look at x_α as the probability of obtaining the results induced by that valuation. The conjunct

$$\bigwedge_{U\subseteq A} 0 \leq x_{\phi_A^U} \leq 1$$

imposes that the probability of obtaining the results induced by each possible valuation on A is in the interval $[0,1]$. The conjunct

$$\sum_{U\subseteq A} x_{\phi_A^U} = 1$$

expresses that the sum of those probabilities is one. The conjunct

$$x_{\phi_{A'}^{U'}} = \sum_{\substack{U\subseteq A\\ U\cap A' = U'}} x_{\phi_A^U}$$

is a marginal probability condition, and the conjunct

$$x_{\alpha_i} = \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_{\alpha_i}\to\{0,1\}\\ v\Vdash_{\mathsf{c}}\alpha_i}} x_{\phi_{B_{\alpha_i}}^{\{B_j\in B_{\alpha_i}:v(B_j)=1\}}}$$

expresses that the probability of α_i being true in a quantum structure is the sum of the probabilities of obtaining the results induced by each valuation that satisfies the formula. Finally, each variable $x_{A'}$ is intended to represent whether or not the observables associated with the propositional symbols in A' are compatible. So, the conjunct

$$\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq A \\ |A'| = 2}} x_{A'} \geq 0$$

states that each such variable should have a non-negative value and the formula $Q^A_{\odot}$, i.e.

$$\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq A \\ |A'| = 2}} x_{A'} = 0$$

states that the value of each such variable is 0 when the observables associated with the propositional symbols in A' are compatible.

We are now ready to define an equivalent RCOF formula for each PLQO formula. Given an atomic formula β of PLQO, let β^{RCOF} be the RCOF formula

$$\begin{cases} Q^{eB_\alpha}_{\odot} \wedge (x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p) & \text{if } \beta \text{ is } \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p \\ Q^{eB_\alpha}_{\odot} & \text{if } \beta \text{ is } \odot\alpha. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we define φ^{RCOF}, where φ is a formula of PLQO, inductively as follows:

- φ^{RCOF} is β^{RCOF} whenever φ is either $\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$ or $\odot\alpha$;
- φ^{RCOF} is $\varphi_1^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \supset \varphi_2^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ whenever φ is $\varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2$.

In the sequel, we denote by $\varphi_{\int}$ the set of formulas of the kind $\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$ that occur in φ, by $\varphi_{\odot}$ the set of formulas of the form $\odot\alpha$ that occur in φ and by B_φ the set

$$\bigcup_{\substack{\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p_j \in \varphi_{\int} \text{ or} \\ \odot\alpha \in \varphi_{\odot}}} B_\alpha.$$

The calculus for PLQO embodies classical reasoning and makes use of RCOF theorems. It contains the following axioms and rules, assuming that φ_1, φ_2 are formulas and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k, \beta$ are literals:

TT $\dfrac{}{\varphi}$

provided that φ is a tautological formula;

MP $\dfrac{\varphi_1 \quad \varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2}{\varphi_2}$;

RR $\dfrac{}{(\beta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta_k) \supset \beta}$ provided that

$$\forall \left(\left(Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \right) \supset \beta^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \right)$$

is a theorem of RCOF where φ is $(\beta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta_k) \supset \beta$.

Axioms TT and rule MP extend classical reasoning to PLQO formulas. Axioms RR import all we need from RCOF for deriving PLQO assertions on quantum observability.

Examples

We start by showing that

$$\vdash (\odot\, \alpha_1) \equiv (\odot\, \alpha_2)$$

provided that $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha_1 \equiv \alpha_2$, that is, observability is preserved by classical equivalence. Observe that $eB_{\alpha_1} = eB_{\alpha_2}$ since $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha_1 \equiv \alpha_2$. Hence,

$$Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_1}} \text{ is } Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_2}}$$

and so,

$$\forall \left(\left(Q^{B_{(\odot\, \alpha_1) \supset (\odot\, \alpha_2)}, \emptyset} \wedge Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_1}} \right) \supset Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_2}} \right)$$

and

$$\forall \left(\left(Q^{B_{(\odot\, \alpha_2) \supset (\odot\, \alpha_1)}, \emptyset} \wedge Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_2}} \right) \supset Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_1}} \right)$$

are theorems of RCOF. Thus, we have the derivation in Figure 1.

As another example, we now prove that

$$\vdash \odot\, \mathtt{tt},$$

1	$\forall\left(\left(Q^{B_{(\odot\,\alpha_1)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_2)},\emptyset}\wedge Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_1}}\right)\supset Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_2}}\right)$	RCOF
2	$(\odot\,\alpha_1)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_2)$	RR 1
3	$\forall\left(\left(Q^{B_{(\odot\,\alpha_2)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_1)},\emptyset}\wedge Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_2}}\right)\supset Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_1}}\right)$	RCOF
4	$(\odot\,\alpha_2)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_1)$	RR 3
5	$((\odot\,\alpha_1)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_2))\supset(((\odot\,\alpha_2)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_1))\supset((\odot\,\alpha_1)\equiv(\odot\,\alpha_2)))$	TT
6	$((\odot\,\alpha_2)\supset(\odot\,\alpha_1))\supset((\odot\,\alpha_1)\equiv(\odot\,\alpha_2))$	MP 2, 5
7	$(\odot\,\alpha_1)\equiv(\odot\,\alpha_2)$	MP 4, 6

Figure 1: $\vdash(\odot\,\alpha_1)\equiv(\odot\,\alpha_2)$ provided that $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}}\alpha_1\equiv\alpha_2$.

that is, that $\mathbb{tt}$ is always observable. Indeed,

$$\forall\left(Q^{\emptyset,\emptyset}\supset(\odot\,\mathbb{tt})^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right)$$

is a theorem of RCOF since $Q^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$ is

$$(0\leq x_{\mathbb{tt}}\leq 1)\wedge(x_{\mathbb{tt}}=1)\wedge(x_{\mathbb{tt}}=x_{\mathbb{tt}})\wedge\mathbb{tt}\wedge\mathbb{tt}$$

which is equivalent to $x_{\mathbb{tt}}=1$, and $(\odot\,\mathbb{tt})^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ is $Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\mathbb{tt}}}$ which is $\mathbb{tt}$. Hence,

$$Q^{\emptyset,\emptyset}\supset(\odot\,\mathbb{tt})^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$$

is tautologically equivalent to $\mathbb{tt}$. Therefore, by RR, we have that $\odot\,\mathbb{tt}$ is a theorem.

As a consequence of these two examples, every tautology is observable taking into account the two given examples.

Finally, we prove that

$$\odot(B_1\wedge B_2)\vdash\int(B_1\wedge B_2)\geq 0.$$

Observe that

- $Q^{\{B_1,B_2\},\{B_1\wedge B_2\}}$ is

$$\left(\bigwedge_{U\subseteq\{B_1,B_2\}}0\leq x_{\phi^U_{\{B_1,B_2\}}}\leq 1\right)\wedge\left(\sum_{U\subseteq\{B_1,B_2\}}x_{\phi^U_{\{B_1,B_2\}}}=1\right)\wedge$$

1	$\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2)$	HYP
2	$\forall\left(\left(Q^{\{B_1,B_2\},\{B_1\wedge B_2\}} \wedge (\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2))^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right) \supset (\int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right)$	RCOF
3	$(\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2)) \supset (\int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0)$	RR 2
4	$\int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0$	MP 1, 3

Figure 2: $\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2) \vdash \int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0$.

$$\left(\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq \{B_1,B_2\}\\ U' \subseteq A'}} x_{\phi^{U'}_{A'}} = \sum_{\substack{U \subseteq \{B_1,B_2\}\\ U \cap A' = U'}} x_{\phi^{U}_{\{B_1,B_2\}}}\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq \{B_1,B_2\}\\ |A'|=2}} x_{A'} \geq 0\right) \wedge \left(x_{B_1\wedge B_2} = x_{\phi^{\{B_1,B_2\}}_{\{B_1,B_2\}}}\right);$$

- $(\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2))^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ is $Q^{\{B_1,B_2\}}_{\odot}$, that is,

$$\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq \{B_1,B_2\}\\ |A'|=2}} x_{A'} = 0;$$

- $(\int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ is

$$\left(\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq \{B_1,B_2\}\\ |A'|=2}} x_{A'} = 0\right) \wedge x_{B_1\wedge B_2} \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\forall\left(\left(Q^{\{B_1,B_2\},\{B_1\wedge B_2\}} \wedge (\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2))^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right) \supset (\int(B_1 \wedge B_2) \geq 0)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right)$$

is a theorem of RCOF. Thus, we have the derivation in Figure 2.

4 Strong soundness

In this section we show that the calculus for PLQO is strongly sound, starting by proving some auxiliary results namely that Prob_I is a probability assignment.

Given a quantum structure I, an orthonormal basis U of $\mathcal{H}$, a set $A \subseteq B$ and a valuation v on A, we denote by

$$U_v$$

the set $\{|u\rangle \in U : O_j|u\rangle = \lambda_j|u\rangle, \lambda_j \in D^v_{B_j}, B_j \in A\}$.

Proposition 4.1 Given a quantum structure I, an orthonormal basis U of $\mathcal{H}$, $A \subseteq A' \subseteq B$ and $v : A \to \{0,1\}$, then

$$\{U_{v'} : v' : A' \to \{0,1\} \text{ and } v'|_A = v\}$$

is a partition of U_v.

Proof:
(1) $U_{v'_1} \cap U_{v'_2} = \emptyset$ for every $v'_1, v'_2 : A' \to \{0,1\}$ such that $v'_1|_A = v$ and $v'_2|_A = v$ and $v'_1 \neq v'_2$.
Indeed, suppose, by contradiction that $U_{v'_1} \cap U_{v'_2} \neq \emptyset$. Let $|u'\rangle \in U_{v'_1} \cap U_{v'_2}$. Since $v'_1 \neq v'_2$ then there is $B_{j'} \in A'$ such that $v'_1(B_{j'}) \neq v'_2(B_{j'})$. Hence $D^{v'_1}_{B_{j'}} \neq D^{v'_2}_{B_{j'}}$ and so $D^{v'_1}_{B_{j'}} \cap D^{v'_2}_{B_{j'}} = \emptyset$. Thus, there is no $\lambda_{j'}$ such that $O_{j'}|u'\rangle = \lambda_{j'}|u'\rangle$ and $\lambda_{j'} \in D^{v'_1}_{B_{j'}}$ and $\lambda_{j'} \in D^{v'_2}_{B_{j'}}$ contradicting the assumption that $|u'\rangle \in U_{v'_1}$ and $|u'\rangle \in U_{v'_2}$.

(2) $U_v \subseteq \bigcup_{v':A'\to\{0,1\}, v'|_A = v} U_{v'}$.
Indeed, let $|u\rangle \in U_v$. Then, for every $B_j \in A$ we have $O_j|u\rangle = \lambda_j|u\rangle$ and $\lambda_j \in D^v_{B_j}$. Let $v' : A' \to \{0,1\}$ be the valuation such that

$$v'(B_{j'}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda_{j'} \in \uparrow_{j'} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for each $B_{j'} \in A'$ and $\lambda_{j'}$ such that $O_{j'}|u\rangle = \lambda_{j'}|u\rangle$. Then, it is immediate to see that $|u\rangle \in U_{v'}$ by definition of v'. It remains to show that $v'|_A = v$. Indeed, let $B_j \in A$. There are two cases.
(a) $v'|_A(B_j) = 1$. Then, $O_j|u\rangle = \lambda_j|u\rangle$ and $\lambda_j \in \uparrow_j$. Hence, $D^v_{B_j} = \uparrow_j$ since $|u\rangle \in U_v$. So, $v(B_j) = 1$.

(b) $v'|_A(B_j) = 0$. We omit the proof since it is similar to (1).

(3) $U_{v'} \subseteq U_v$ for every $v' : A' \to \{0,1\}$ such that $v'|_A = v$. Let $v' : A' \to \{0,1\}$ be an arbitrary valuation such that $v'|_A = v$. Let $|u'\rangle \in U_{v'}$. Then, for every $B_{j'} \in A'$ we have $O_{j'}|u'\rangle = \lambda_{j'}|u'\rangle$ and $\lambda_{j'} \in D^{v'}_{B_{j'}}$. Let $B_j \in A$. Hence, $O_j u' = \lambda_j |u'\rangle$ and $\lambda_j \in D^{v'}_{B_j}$. Observe that $v'(B_j) = v(B_j)$. So $D^{v'}_{B_j} = D^{v}_{B_j}$. Therefore, $|u'\rangle \in U_v$. QED

Note that, given a quantum structure I, an orthonormal basis U of $\mathcal{H}$ and a valuation $v : \{B_{j_1}, \ldots, B_{j_k}\} \to \{0,1\}$, the vector $\mathrm{Proj}_{D^v_{B_{j_k}}} \ldots \mathrm{Proj}_{D^v_{B_{j_1}}} |\psi\rangle$ is

$$\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle |u\rangle.$$

Proposition 4.2 Given a quantum structure $I = (\mathcal{H}, |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$, an orthonormal basis U of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$, then

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle^2 \right).$$

Proof:
Let U be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume without loss of generality that $B_\alpha = \{B_1, \ldots, B_k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \mathsf{Prob}\left(\langle (\underline{B}_1)_{|\psi\rangle}, \ldots, (\underline{B}_k)_{|\psi\rangle}\rangle = \langle D^v_{B_1}, \ldots, D^v_{B_k}\rangle\right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \langle\psi| \mathrm{Proj}_{D^v_{B_k}} \ldots \mathrm{Proj}_{D^v_{B_1}} |\psi\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \langle\psi| \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle |u\rangle \right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

QED

Proposition 4.3 Given a quantum structure I, Prob_I is a probability assignment.

Proof:
Let U be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$.

(1) $0 \leq \mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) \leq 1$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\ &\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{|u\rangle \in U} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \qquad (*) \\ &= 1,\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ holds, by Proposition 4.1 since $\{U_v : v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}$ is a partition of U.

(2) If $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$ then $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = 1$. Assuming that α is a tautology, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{|u\rangle \in U} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \qquad (*)\end{aligned}$$

$$= 1,$$

where $(*)$ holds, by Proposition 4.1 since $\{U_v : v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}$ is a partition of U.

(3) If $\alpha \models_{\mathsf{c}} \beta$ then $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) \leq \mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta)$. Assume that $\alpha \models_{\mathsf{c}} \beta$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha \cup B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v'|_{B_\alpha} = v}} \sum_{|u'\rangle \in U_{v'}} \langle \psi | u' \rangle^2 \right) \qquad (*) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha \cup B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v' \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \sum_{|u'\rangle \in U_{v'}} \langle \psi | u' \rangle^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha \cup B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v' \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta}} \sum_{|u'\rangle \in U_{v'}} \langle \psi | u' \rangle^2 \qquad (**) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta}} \left(\sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha \cup B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v'|_{B_\alpha} = v}} \sum_{|u'\rangle \in U_{v'}} \langle \psi | u' \rangle^2 \right) \qquad (*) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\beta \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) \\
&= \mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta)
\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ follows from Proposition 4.1 and $(**)$ follows by the hypothesis $\alpha \models_{\mathsf{c}} \beta$.

(4) If $\models_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\beta \wedge \alpha)$ then $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta \vee \alpha) = \mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta) + \mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha)$. Assume that

$\models_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\beta \wedge \alpha)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta \vee \alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_{\beta\vee\alpha}\to\{0,1\}\\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta\vee\alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle\in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle^2\right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha\cup B_\beta\to\{0,1\}\\ v' \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta\vee\alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u'\rangle\in U_{v'}} \langle\psi|u'\rangle^2\right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha\cup B_\beta\to\{0,1\}\\ v' \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta}} \left(\sum_{|u'\rangle\in U_{v'}} \langle\psi|u'\rangle^2\right) + \\
&\qquad \sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B_\alpha\cup B_\beta\to\{0,1\}\\ v' \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u'\rangle\in U_{v'}} \langle\psi|u'\rangle^2\right) \qquad (*) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\beta\to\{0,1\}\\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \beta}} \sum_{|u\rangle\in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle^2\right) + \left(\sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha\to\{0,1\}\\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \sum_{|u\rangle\in U_v} \langle\psi|u\rangle^2\right) (**) \\
&= \mathsf{Prob}_I(\beta) + \mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha)
\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ holds by Proposition 4.1 and $(**)$ holds by the hypothesis $\models_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\beta \wedge \alpha)$. QED

Now we are ready to show that the proposed axiomatization of PLQO is strongly sound.

Proposition 4.4 The logic PLQO is strongly sound.

Proof:
The rules are sound. We only check that axiom RR is sound since the proof of the others is straightforward.

Rule (RR). Let I be a quantum structure and $\rho : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be an assignment. Assume that

$$I\rho \Vdash \beta_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \beta_k$$

and that

$$\forall \left(\left(Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \right) \supset \beta^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \right) \quad (*)$$

is in RCOF. Let $\rho' : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be an assignment such that $\rho'(x) = \rho(x)$ for $x \in X_{\mathbb{N}}$,

$$\rho'(x_\alpha) = \mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha)$$

for every $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$, and

$$\rho'(x_{\{B_i, B_j\}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{\underline{B_i}, \underline{B_j}\} \text{ is a compatible set of quantum variables} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for every $B_i, B_j \in B_\varphi$. We now show that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

We start by proving that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}}.$$

(a) $0 \leq \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}}) \leq 1$. Let $U \subseteq B_\varphi$. Since

$$\rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}}) = \mathsf{Prob}_I(\phi^U_{B_\varphi})$$

then $0 \leq \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}}) \leq 1$ by Proposition 4.2.

(b) $\sum_{U \subseteq B_\varphi} \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}}) = 1$. Observe that

$$\bigvee_{U \subseteq B_\varphi} \phi^U_{B_\varphi}$$

is a tautology and so

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\bigvee_{U \subseteq B_\varphi} \phi^U_{B_\varphi}) = 1$$

by Proposition 4.2. Since, for distinct $U_1, U_2 \subseteq B_\varphi$,

$$\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\phi^{U_1}_{B_\varphi} \wedge \phi^{U_2}_{B_\varphi}),$$

then, by Proposition 4.2,

$$\sum_{U \subseteq B_\varphi} \mathsf{Prob}_I(\phi^U_{B_\varphi}) = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{U \subseteq B_\varphi} \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}}) = 1.$$

(c) $\rho'(x_{\phi^{U'}_{A'}}) = \sum_{\substack{U \subseteq B_\varphi \\ U \cap A' = U'}} \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}})$ for every $A' \subseteq B_\varphi$ and $U' \subseteq A'$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'(x_{\phi^{U'}_{A'}}) &= \mathsf{Prob}_I(\phi^{U'}_{A'}) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{U \subseteq B_\varphi \\ U \cap A' = U'}} \mathsf{Prob}_I(\phi^U_{B_\varphi}) \qquad (*) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{U \subseteq B_\varphi \\ U \cap A' = U'}} \rho'(x_{\phi^U_{B_\varphi}})
\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ holds by Proposition 4.1 since

$$\models_{\mathsf{c}} \phi^{U'}_{A'} \equiv \bigvee_{\substack{U \subseteq B_\varphi \\ U \cap A' = U'}} \phi^U_{B_\varphi}$$

and $\models_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\phi^{U_1}_{B_\varphi} \wedge \phi^{U_2}_{B_\varphi})$ for every $U_1, U_2 \subseteq B_\varphi$ with $U_1 \cap A' = U'$ and $U_2 \cap A' = U'$.

(d) $\rho'(x_{A'} \geq 0)$ for every $A' \subseteq B_\varphi$ with $|A'| = 2$. Immediate by definition.

(e) $\rho'(x_\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \rho'(x_{\phi^{\{B_j \in B_\alpha : v(B_j) = 1\}}_{B_\alpha}})$ for every $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$ such that $\int \alpha \mathbin{@} p \in \varphi_\int$. Observe that

$$\models_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha \equiv \left(\bigvee_{\substack{v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \phi^{\{B_j \in B_\alpha : v(B_j) = 1\}}_{B_\alpha} \right)$$

and that

$$\models_{\mathsf{c}} \neg(\phi^{\{B_j \in B_\alpha : v_1(B_j) = 1\}}_{B_\alpha} \wedge \phi^{\{B_j \in B_\alpha : v_2(B_j) = 1\}}_{B_\alpha})$$

for every distinct pair $v_1, v_2 : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}$. Thererefore, by Proposition 4.2, the thesis follows.

Finally we show that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

We consider four cases.
(1) β_j is $\odot\,\alpha_j$. Recall that $I\rho \Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j$. Hence, α_j is I-observable, that is $\underline{\alpha_j}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables. Thus,

$$\rho'(x_{\{B_{i_1}, B_{i_2}\}}) = 0$$

for every distinct $B_{i_1}, B_{i_2} \in eB_{\alpha_j}$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}}.$$

(2) β_j is $\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j$. We have to prove that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}} \wedge (x_{\alpha_j} \mathbin{@} p_j).$$

Recall that $I\rho \Vdash \int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j$. Then $I\rho \Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j$. Hence, by (1),

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}}.$$

On the other hand, since $I\rho \Vdash \int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j$, then

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha_j) \mathbin{@} p_j^{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Thus,

$$\rho'(x_{\alpha_j}) \mathbin{@} p_j^{\mathbb{R}}$$

and so, $\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} x_{\alpha_j} \mathbin{@} p_j$.
(3) β_j is $\odot\,\alpha_j \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)$. Recall that $I\rho \Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)$. Hence either $I\rho \not\Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j$ or $I\rho \Vdash \int \mathtt{tt} < 1$.
We now prove that $I\rho \not\Vdash \int \mathtt{tt} < 1$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $I\rho \Vdash \int \mathtt{tt} < 1$. Hence, $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\mathtt{tt}) < 1$. Since $\mathtt{tt}$ is a tautology, then, by Proposition 4.2, $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\mathtt{tt}) = 1$ and so we have a contradiction.

Therefore, $I\rho \not\Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j$. Hence, α_j is not an I-observable, that is α_j is not a compatible set of quantum variables. Thus, there are distinct $B_{i_1}, B_{i_2} \in eB_{\alpha_j}$ such that $\underline{B}_{i_1}$ and $\underline{B}_{i_2}$ are not compatible. Hence, by definition,

$$\rho'(x_{\{B_{i_1}, B_{i_2}\}}) = 1.$$

So,

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (\odot\,\alpha_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \supset (\textstyle\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$$

since $Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}}$ is $(\odot\,\alpha_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$.

(4) β_j is $(\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j) \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)$. Recall that $I\rho \Vdash (\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j) \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)$. Hence either $I\rho \not\Vdash \int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j$ or $I\rho \Vdash \int \mathtt{tt} < 1$. Since, $I\rho \not\Vdash \int \mathtt{tt} < 1$ as proved in (3), then $I\rho \not\Vdash \int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j$. Consider two cases:

(a) $I\rho \not\Vdash \odot\,\alpha_j$. Then, by (3),

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}},$$

hence

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}} \wedge (x_{\alpha_j} \mathbin{@} p_j)$$

and so

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (\textstyle\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (\textstyle\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

(b) $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha_j) \not@\, p_j^{\mathbb{R}\rho'}$. Then,

$$\rho'(x_{\alpha_j}) \not@\, p_j^{\mathbb{R}\rho'}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_{\alpha_j}} \wedge (x_{\alpha_j} \mathbin{@} p_j)$$

and so

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \not\Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (\textstyle\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (\textstyle\int \alpha_j \mathbin{@} p_j)^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \supset (\int \mathtt{tt} < 1)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

In this way, we conclude the proof of

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

Returning to the main proof, observe that, by (*),

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \left(Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int \alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}} \right) \supset \beta^{\mathsf{RCOF}},$$

so

$$\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \beta^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

It remains to prove that $I\rho \Vdash \beta$. There are four cases:

(1) β is $\odot\alpha$. Recall that $\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$. Hence $\rho'(x_{\{B_{i_1},B_{i_2}\}}) = 0$ for every distinct $B_{i_1}, B_{i_2} \in eB_\alpha$. Thus, by definition of ρ', $\{\underline{B_{i_1}}, \underline{B_{i_2}}\}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables. Therefore, $\underline{\alpha}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables, that is α is an I-observable formula and so $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha$.

(2) β is $\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Recall that $\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha} \wedge (x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p)$. Therefore, by (1), $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha$. Moreover, $\rho'(x_\alpha) \mathbin{@} p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$. Hence, by definition of ρ',

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) \mathbin{@} p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$$

and so $I\rho \Vdash \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$.

(3) β is $\odot\alpha \supset (\int\mathbb{t} < 1)$. Recall that $\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha} \supset (x_{\mathbb{t}} < 1)$. Since $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} x_{\mathbb{t}} < 1$ then $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$. Hence $\rho'(x_{\{B_{i_1},B_{i_2}\}}) = 1$ for some distinct $B_{i_1}, B_{i_2} \in eB_\alpha$. Thus, by definition of ρ', $\{\underline{B_{i_1}}, \underline{B_{i_2}}\}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables. Therefore, $\underline{\alpha}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables, that is α is not an I-observable formula and so $I\rho \nVdash \odot\alpha$. Thus, $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha \supset (\int\mathbb{t} < 1)$.

(4) β is $(\int\alpha \mathbin{@} p) \supset (\int\mathbb{t} < 1)$. Recall that $\mathbb{R}\rho' \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} (Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha} \wedge (x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p)) \supset (x_{\mathbb{t}} < 1)$. Hence $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha} \wedge (x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p)$, since, $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} x_{\mathbb{t}} < 1$. Consider two cases:

(a) $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$. Then, by (3),

$$I\rho \nVdash \odot\alpha$$

and so $I\rho \nVdash \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Therefore $I\rho \Vdash \beta$.

(b) $\mathbb{R}\rho' \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Then, $\rho'(x_\alpha) \not@\, p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$. Thus, $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) \not@\, p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$ and so $I\rho \nVdash \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Therefore $I\rho \Vdash \beta$. QED

5 Weak completeness

The objective of this section is to show that PLQO is weakly complete. That is, for every formula $\varphi \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$, if $\vDash \varphi$ then $\vdash \varphi$. There is no hope that there is a finitary calculus for which PLQO is strongly complete since, as we referred above, PLQO is not compact.

We prove the weak completeness by contrapositive, that is, if $\nvdash \varphi$ then $\nvDash \varphi$. Hence, assuming that φ is not derivable, we show that there is a quantum structure that falsifies φ. With this purpose in mind, we start by

defining a generic quantum structure that will be relevant not only for weak completeness but also for conservativeness.

Given a finite set $B' \subseteq B$, $\mathsf{NC} \subseteq B' \times B'$ and a map $f : \{0, \ldots, 2^{|B'|}-1\} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{2^{|B'|}-1} f(j)\overline{f(j)}} = 1,$$

let

$$I^{B',\mathsf{NC},f} = (\mathcal{H}, |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$$

be such that

- $\mathcal{H}$ is $\mathbb{C}^{2^{|B'|}+2|\mathsf{NC}|}$ and fix

  $$\{|v_0\rangle, \ldots, |v_{2^{|B'|}-1}\rangle\} \cup \bigcup_{A \in \mathsf{NC}} \{|\overline{A}\rangle, |\underline{A}\rangle\}$$

  as a basis for $\mathcal{H}$ where $v_k : B' \to \{0,1\}$ is the valuation $B_j \mapsto b_j$ where b_j is the j-th bit in the binary decomposition of k;

- $|\psi\rangle$ is

  $$\sum_{j=0}^{2^{|B'|}-1} f(j)\,|v_j\rangle;$$

- For each $B_j \in B'$, $\underline{B}_j = (O_j, \{\{0,1\}, \{0,1\}^{\mathsf{c}}\})$ with

  $$O_j = \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_j)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right) + \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_j)=0\}} -|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right) +$$
  $$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_j)\in\mathsf{NC}: j<i\}} |\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_j)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_j)}}|\right) +$$
  $$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_j)\in\mathsf{NC}: j>i\}} |\underline{(B_i,B_j)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_j)}|\right) +$$
  $$\left(\sum_{\{A\in\mathsf{NC}: B_j\notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|\right)$$

  where

  $$|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_j)}}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\,|\overline{(B_i,B_j)}\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\,|\underline{(B_i,B_j)}\rangle;$$

- For $B_j \notin B'$, choose for O_j an arbitrary observable and for $\mathcal{D}_j$ any partition of Ω_j (the spectrum of O_j) with two elements.

Observe that the Hilbert space of $I^{B',\mathsf{NC},f}$ has a finite basis including vectors representing the valuations over the finite set B' of propositional symbols and vectors assigned to the non compatible pairs in NC. The map f corresponds to the "mass" of each valuation. So, the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is a superposition of the valuation vectors each weighted by its mass. The operator O_j associated with a propositional symbol $B_j \in B'$ is the sum of several operators:

- The projection $\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_j)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$ stating that the vectors associated with the valuations that satisfy B_j are eigenvectors with eigenvalue 1.

- The operator $\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_j)=0\}} -|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$ stating that the vectors associated with the valuations that do not satisfy B_j are eigenvectors with eigenvalue -1.

- The projection $\sum_{\{(B_i,B_j)\in\mathsf{NC}:j<i\}} |\overline{(B_i,B_j)}\rangle\langle\overline{(B_i,B_j)}|$ and the projection $\sum_{\{(B_i,B_j)\in\mathsf{NC}:j>i\}} |\underline{(B_i,B_j)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_j)}|$ referring to the incompatible pairs where B_j appears which were defined so that $\widetilde{O}_i$ and $\widetilde{O}_j$ are not compatible (observe that that the two vectors associated with the pair (B_i, B_j) are eigenvectors with eigenvalues 1 and 0).

- The projection $\sum_{\{A\in\mathsf{NC}:B_j\notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|$ stating that the vectors referring to the incompatible pairs where B_j does not appear are eigenvectors with eigenvalue 1.

So, O_j is an observable since it is a self-adjoint operator.

The next result states that the pairs of propositional symbols in NC correspond to incompatible quantum variables in $I^{B',\mathsf{NC},f}$ and vice-versa.

Proposition 5.1 Let $B_\ell, B_m \in B'$ be distinct variables. Then, $\{\underline{B}_\ell, \underline{B}_m\}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables in $I^{B',\mathsf{NC},f}$ iff $(B_\ell, B_m) \in \mathsf{NC}$.

Proof:
($\leftarrow$) Assume that $(B_\ell, B_m) \in \mathsf{NC}$ and that $\ell < m$. Observe that

$$\widetilde{O}_\ell = \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_\ell)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k| \right) +$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell<i,i\neq m\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}|\right)+$$

$$|\underline{\overline{(B_m,B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_m,B_\ell)}}|+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell>i\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{A\in\mathsf{NC}:B_\ell\notin A\}}|\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}|+|\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|\right)$$

and

$$\widetilde{O}_m=\left(\sum_{\{v_k:v_k(B_m)=1\}}|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_m)\in\mathsf{NC}:m<i\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}|\right)+$$

$$|\underline{(B_m,B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_m,B_\ell)}|+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_m)\in\mathsf{NC}:m>i,i\neq\ell\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_m)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_m)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{A\in\mathsf{NC}:B_m\notin A\}}|\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}|+|\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|\right).$$

We now show that

$$\widetilde{O}_m\widetilde{O}_\ell\neq\widetilde{O}_\ell\widetilde{O}_m.$$

Indeed,

$$\widetilde{O}_m\widetilde{O}_\ell=\left(\sum_{\{v_k:v_k(B_\ell)=v_k(B_m)=1\}}|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell<i,i\neq m\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}|\right)+$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\,|\underline{(B_m,B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_m,B_\ell)}}|+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell>i\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_m)\in\mathsf{NC}:m<i\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_m)\in\mathsf{NC}:m>i,i\neq\ell\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_m)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_m)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{A\in\mathsf{NC}:B_\ell,B_m\notin A\}}|\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}|+|\underline{\overline{A}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{A}}|\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\widetilde{O}_\ell\widetilde{O}_m=\left(\sum_{\{v_k:v_k(B_\ell)=v_k(B_m)=1\}}|v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{\{B_i,B_m\}\in\mathsf{NC}:m<i\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_m)}}|\right)+$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\,|\underline{\overline{(B_m,B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_m,B_\ell)}|+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_m)\in\mathsf{NC}:m>i,i\neq\ell\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_m)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_m)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell<i,i\neq m\}}|\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\underline{\overline{(B_i,B_\ell)}}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{(B_i,B_\ell)\in\mathsf{NC}:\ell>i\}}|\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i,B_\ell)}|\right)+$$

$$\left(\sum_{\{A \in \mathsf{NC}: B_\ell, B_m \notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}| \right).$$

Hence

$$\widetilde{O}_m\widetilde{O}_\ell - \widetilde{O}_\ell\widetilde{O}_m = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \left(|\underline{(B_m, B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\overline{(B_m, B_\ell)}| - |\overline{(B_m, B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_m, B_\ell)}| \right) \neq 0.$$

Therefore, $\{\underline{B}_m, \underline{B}_\ell\}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables.

($\rightarrow$) Assume that $(B_\ell, B_m) \notin \mathsf{NC}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{O}_\ell = & \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_\ell)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{(B_i, B_\ell) \in \mathsf{NC}: \ell < i\}} |\overline{\underline{(B_i, B_\ell)}}\rangle\langle\overline{\underline{(B_i, B_\ell)}}| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{(B_i, B_\ell) \in \mathsf{NC}: \ell > i\}} |\underline{(B_i, B_\ell)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i, B_\ell)}| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{A \in \mathsf{NC}: B_\ell \notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}| \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{O}_m = & \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_m)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{(B_i, B_m) \in \mathsf{NC}: m < i\}} |\overline{\underline{(B_i, B_m)}}\rangle\langle\overline{\underline{(B_i, B_m)}}| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{(B_i, B_m) \in \mathsf{NC}: m > i\}} |\underline{(B_i, B_m)}\rangle\langle\underline{(B_i, B_m)}| \right) + \\
& \left(\sum_{\{A \in \mathsf{NC}: B_m \notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\widetilde{O}_m\widetilde{O}_\ell = \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_\ell)=v_k(B_m)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right) + \left(\sum_{\{A\in \mathsf{NC}: B_\ell, B_m \notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|\right)$$

and

$$\widetilde{O}_\ell\widetilde{O}_m = \left(\sum_{\{v_k : v_k(B_\ell)=v_k(B_m)=1\}} |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\right) + \left(\sum_{\{A\in \mathsf{NC}: B_\ell, B_m \notin A\}} |\underline{A}\rangle\langle\underline{A}| + |\overline{A}\rangle\langle\overline{A}|\right).$$

Hence

$$\widetilde{O}_m\widetilde{O}_\ell - \widetilde{O}_\ell\widetilde{O}_m = 0.$$

Therefore, $\{\underline{B}_m, \underline{B}_\ell\}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables. QED

We now proceed towards the weak completeness of the calculus. We start by proving a finite dimensional model existence lemma showing that we can move back and forth between satisfaction of certain RCOF formulas and satisfaction of PLQO formulas.

Proposition 5.2 Let φ be a formula of PLQO, $B' \subseteq B$ a finite set such that $B_\varphi \subseteq B'$ and Δ a finite set of propositional formulas containing $\{\alpha : \int\alpha \mathbin{@} p \in \varphi_\int\}$. Let ρ be an assignment over $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B',\Delta}.$$

Then, there is a finite dimensional quantum structure I such that

$$I\rho \Vdash \varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

Proof: Assume that $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B',\Delta}$ and assume without loss of generality that B' is the set $\{B_1, \ldots, B_{|B'|}\}$. Consider the quantum structure

$$I = I^{B',\mathsf{NC},f}$$

where

$$\mathsf{NC} = \{(B_i, B_j) : \rho(x_{\{B_i,B_j\}}) > 0, B_i, B_j \in B', i \neq j\}$$

and

$$f(j) = \sqrt{\rho(x_{\phi^{U_j}_{B'}})}$$

where $U_j = \{B_k \in B' : v_j(B_k) = 1\}$ for each $j = 0, \ldots, 2^{|B'|} - 1$.

We prove that

$$I\rho \Vdash \varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$$

by induction on the structure of φ.

Basis: There are two cases:

(a) φ is $\odot\,\alpha$. Recall that $(\odot\,\alpha)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ is $Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$ and so is

$$\bigwedge_{\substack{A' \subseteq eB_\alpha \\ |A'|=2}} x_{A'} = 0.$$

($\leftarrow$) Assume that $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$. Hence, $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash x_{A'} = 0$ for every $A' \subseteq eB_\alpha$ with $|A'| = 2$ since $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$. We must show that $\underline{\alpha} = \{\underline{B}_j : B_j \in eB_\alpha\}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables. Let $\{\underline{B}_i, \underline{B}_j\}$ be a set of quantum variables in $\underline{\alpha}$. Observe that $(\underline{B}_i, \underline{B}_j) \notin \mathsf{NC}$. Thus, by Proposition 5.1, $\{\underline{B}_i, \underline{B}_j\}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables. Thus, $I\rho \Vdash \varphi$.

($\rightarrow$) Assume that $\mathbb{R}\rho \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$. Then, there is $\{B_\ell, B_m\} \subseteq eB_\alpha$ such that

$$\rho(x_{\{B_\ell, B_m\}}) > 0.$$

Hence, $(B_\ell, B_m) \in \mathsf{NC}$. Thus, by Proposition 5.1, $\{\underline{B}_m, \underline{B}_\ell\}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables. Therefore, also $\underline{\alpha}$ is not a compatible set of quantum variables and so α is not an I-observable formula. Thus, $I\rho \nVdash \varphi$.

(b) φ is $\int \alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Recall that $(\int \alpha \mathbin{@} p)^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$ is $Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha} \wedge (x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) && (*) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B' \to \{0,1\} \\ v'|_{B_\alpha} = v}} \langle \psi | v' \rangle^2 \right) && (**) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{\substack{v'\,:\,B' \to \{0,1\} \\ v'|_{B_\alpha} = v}} \rho(x_{\phi_{B'}^{\{B_k \in B' : v'(B_k)=1\}}}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \rho(x_{\phi_{B_\alpha}^{\{B_j \in B_\alpha : v(B_j)=1\}}})
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \rho(x_\alpha)$$

since $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B',\Delta}$, (*) holds by Proposition 4.2 and (**) holds since

$$U_c \cap \{|v_0\rangle, \ldots, |v_{2^{|B'|}-1}\rangle\} = \{v' : v' : B' \to \{0,1\} \text{ and } v'|_{B_\alpha} = v\}$$

and

$$\langle \psi | u \rangle = 0$$

for each $|u\rangle \in \bigcup_{A \in \mathsf{NC}} \{|\overline{A}\rangle, |\underline{A}\rangle\}$.

($\leftarrow$) Assume that $\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$$

and following a similar reasoning to the one in (a), we can conclude that $I\rho \Vdash \odot\alpha$. Moreover, $\rho(x_\alpha) \mathbin{@} p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}$. Then,

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = \rho(x_\alpha) \mathbin{@} p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}.$$

So $I\rho \Vdash \varphi$.

($\rightarrow$) Assume that $\mathbb{R}\rho \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi^{\mathsf{RCOF}}$. There are two cases.
(i) $\mathbb{R}\rho \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q_{\odot}^{eB_\alpha}$. Then, by (a), $I\rho \nVdash \odot\alpha$ and so $I\rho \nVdash \varphi$.
(ii) $\mathbb{R}\rho \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} x_\alpha \mathbin{@} p$. Hence,

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = \rho(x_\alpha) \not@ p^{\mathbb{R}\rho}.$$

Therefore, $I\rho \nVdash \varphi$.

Step: φ is $\varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2$. Then,

$$\begin{array}{rl}
\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi_1 \supset \varphi_2 & \\
\text{iff} & \\
\mathbb{R}\rho \nVdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi_1 \text{ or } \mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} \varphi_2 & \\
\text{iff} & \text{IH} \\
I\rho \nVdash \varphi_1 \text{ or } I\rho \Vdash \varphi_2 & \\
\text{iff} & \\
I\rho \Vdash \varphi &
\end{array}$$

as we wanted to show. QED

Theorem 5.3 The logic PLQO is weakly complete.

Proof:
Let $\varphi \in L_{\mathsf{PLQO}}$. Assume that $\nvdash \varphi$. We proceed to show that $\nvdash \varphi$. First observe that $\neg\varphi$ must be consistent because otherwise from $\neg\varphi$ one would be able to derive every formula, including in particular, φ, and so $\vdash (\neg\varphi)\supset\varphi$, and in that case one would have $\vdash \varphi$. Observe that there are conjunctions of literals $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_\ell$ such that

$$\vdash (\neg\varphi) \equiv \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} \eta_i.$$

Since $\neg\varphi$ is consistent, at least one of the disjuncts must also be consistent. Let η_m be one such consistent disjunct. Assume that η_m is

$$\beta_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \beta_k$$

where each β_j is a literal. For proving that $\nvdash \varphi$ it is enough to show that $\neg\varphi$ is satisfiable. Hence, it is enough to show that there is one satisfiable disjunct. Indeed, η_m is satisfiable as we proceed to prove. Towards a contradiction, assume that there are no I and ρ such that $I\rho \Vdash \eta_m$ holds. Then, by Proposition 5.2, there would not exist ρ such that

$$\mathbb{R}\rho \Vdash_{\mathsf{fo}} Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int\alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}}.$$

Hence, we would have

$$\forall\left(\left(Q^{B_\varphi, \{\alpha : \int\alpha @ p \in \varphi_\int\}} \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right) \supset \mathsf{ff}^{\mathsf{RCOF}}\right) \in \mathsf{RCOF}.$$

Then, by RR, we would establish

$$\eta_m \vdash \mathsf{ff}$$

in contradiction with the consistency of η_m. QED

6 Conservativeness

In this section, we show that PLQO is a conservative extension of classical propositional logic modulo a translation of classical propositional formulas into the language of PLQO.

Proposition 6.1 Let $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$. Then

$$\odot \alpha \vDash \textstyle\int \alpha = 1 \qquad \text{iff} \qquad \vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha.$$

Proof:
($\rightarrow$) Assume that $\odot \alpha \vDash \int \alpha = 1$. Consider the quantum structure

$$I = I^{B_\alpha, \emptyset, f}$$

where $f(j) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^{|B_\alpha|}}}$ for every $j = 0, \ldots, 2^{|B_\alpha|} - 1$, and an arbitrary assignment ρ over $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, by Proposition 5.1, $\{\underline{B}_m, \underline{B}_\ell\}$ is a compatible set of quantum variables for I for every $\underline{B}_m, \underline{B}_\ell \in \underline{\alpha}$. Therefore,

$$I\rho \Vdash \odot \alpha.$$

Hence, by the hypothesis, $I\rho \Vdash \int \alpha = 1$. Then, $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = 1$. Observe that, by Proposition 4.2,

$$\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right)$$

and that

$$\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{2^{|B_\alpha|}},$$

for each $v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}$, because $U_v = \{|v\rangle\}$. Thus, since

$$\sum_{\substack{v\,:\,B_\alpha \to \{0,1\} \\ v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha}} \left(\sum_{|u\rangle \in U_v} \langle \psi | u \rangle^2 \right) = 1$$

we have that $\{v : v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}\} = \{v : v : B_\alpha \to \{0,1\}, v \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha\}$. Therefore, α is a tautology.

($\leftarrow$) Assume that $\vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha$. Let I be a quantum structure and ρ an arbitrary assignment over $\mathbb{R}$. Assume $I\rho \Vdash \odot \alpha$. Since Prob_I is a probability assignment by Proposition 4.3, $\mathsf{Prob}_I(\alpha) = 1$ and so $I\rho \Vdash \int \alpha = 1$. QED

Then, writing

$$\alpha^* \quad \text{for} \quad (\odot \alpha) \supset (\textstyle\int \alpha = 1),$$

for the translation of classical formula α into the language of PLQO, the following corollary holds.

Proposition 6.2 Let $\alpha \in L_{\mathsf{c}}$. Then

$$\vDash \alpha^* \quad \text{iff} \quad \vDash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha.$$

7 Epistemic nature of observability

We now analyse the epistemic aspects of quantum reasoning of observability in PLQO following the steps in [HS15]. Recall that $\odot\,\alpha$ intuitively means that it is possible to do a simultaneous measurement over the essential propositional symbols of α in order to know its truth value. With this in mind, we discuss the behaviour of $\odot$ with respect to the propositional connectives.

We start by considering the law

$$((\odot\,\alpha_1) \wedge (\odot\,\alpha_2)) \equiv (\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2))$$

which is characteristic of an epistemic operator (see for instance [MvdH95]). Observe that there are classical formulas α_1 and α_2 such that

$$\nvDash ((\odot\,\alpha_1) \wedge (\odot\,\alpha_2)) \equiv (\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2)).$$

Indeed, consider the quantum structure I_1 defined in Example 7.1 and let α_1 be B_1 and α_2 be B_2.

Example 7.1 Let

$$I_1 = (L^2(\mathbb{R}), |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$$

be the quantum structure where

- $\underline{B}_1$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_1 is the position observable for the movement of a particle in one dimension and $\uparrow_1$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$;
- $\underline{B}_2$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_2 is the momentum observable for the movement of that particle and $\uparrow_2$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. ∇

Hence $I_1 \Vdash \odot\,B_1$ and $I_2 \Vdash \odot\,B_2$. Furthermore, following the notation in [BHL07], $\widetilde{O}_1$ is O_1^h where $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non periodic Borel function such that

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = k\sqrt{2\pi} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So, using Theorem 5 of [BHL07], we can conclude that $\widetilde{O}_1$ and $\widetilde{O}_2$ do not commute. Hence, $\underline{B}_1$ and $\underline{B}_2$ are not compatible. Therefore,

$$I_1 \nVdash \odot(B_1 \wedge B_2).$$

Thus,

$$I_1 \not\Vdash ((\odot B_1) \wedge (\odot B_2)) \equiv (\odot(B_1 \wedge B_2)).$$

However, the law

$$((\odot \alpha_1) \wedge (\odot \alpha_2)) \equiv (\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2))$$

is satisfiable for some classical formulas α_1 and α_2 in the sense that there is a quantum structure in which it holds. Consider the quantum structure I_2 in Example 7.2 and let α_1 be B_2 and α_2 be B_3.

Example 7.2 Let

$$I_2 = (L^2(\mathbb{R}), |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$$

be a quantum structure where

- $\underline{B}_2$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_2 is the momentum observable for the movement of that particle and $\uparrow_2$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$;
- $\underline{B}_3$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_3 is O_1 and $\uparrow_3$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. ∇

Hence $I_2 \Vdash \odot B_2$ and $I_2 \Vdash \odot B_3$. Furthermore, following the notation in [BHL07], $\widetilde{O}_2$ is O_2^g where $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel function such that

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = k\sqrt{2\pi} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $\widetilde{O}_3$ is O_3^h where $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel function such that

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = k\sqrt{2\pi} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that both h and g are periodic functions with period $\sqrt{2\pi}$ and that

$$\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{2\pi}^2} = 1 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

So, using Theorem 5 of [BHL07], we can conclude that $\widetilde{O}_2$ and $\widetilde{O}_3$ commute. Hence, $\underline{B}_2$ and $\underline{B}_3$ are compatible. Therefore,

$$I_2 \Vdash \odot(B_2 \wedge B_3).$$

Thus,

$$I_2 \Vdash ((\odot B_2) \wedge (\odot B_3)) \equiv (\odot(B_2 \wedge B_3)).$$

In the same vein, we can show that

$$((\odot \alpha_1) \vee (\odot \alpha_2)) \equiv (\odot(\alpha_1 \vee \alpha_2))$$

is satisfiable for some classical formulas α_1 and α_2 but does not hold in general, and the same for the law

$$((\odot \alpha_1) \supset (\odot \alpha_2)) \supset (\odot(\alpha_1 \supset \alpha_2)).$$

Concerning other laws of epistemic logic, note that the introspection axioms cannot be considered in our setting since the language of PLQO does not allow formulas with nested $\odot$ operators. On the other hand, the knowledge axiom

$$(\odot \alpha) \supset \alpha^*$$

holds in general for any tautology α.

Finally, there is no surprise at all due to the intended meaning of $\odot$ that the following distributive law

$$(\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge (\alpha_2 \vee \alpha_3))) \equiv ((\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2) \vee (\odot(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_3)))$$

does not hold. Indeed, consider the quantum structure in Example 7.3 and let α_1 be B_2, α_2 be B_1 and α_3 be B_3.

Example 7.3 Let

$$I_3 = (L^2(\mathbb{R}), |\psi\rangle, B_j \mapsto \underline{B}_j)$$

be the quantum structure where

- $\underline{B}_1$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_1 is the position observable for the movement of a particle in one dimension and $\uparrow_1$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$;
- $\underline{B}_2$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_2 is the momentum observable for the movement of that particle and $\uparrow_2$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$;
- $\underline{B}_3$ is a propositional quantum variable such that O_3 is O_1 and $\uparrow_3$ is the set $\{k\sqrt{2\pi} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. ∇

Then, it is immediate to see that

$$I_3 \nVdash (\odot(B_2 \wedge (B_1 \vee B_3))) \equiv ((\odot(B_2 \wedge B_1) \vee (\odot(B_2 \wedge B_3))).$$

Finally, observe that the formula

$$(\odot\,\alpha) \equiv (\odot(\neg\,\alpha))$$

holds in general since $eB_\alpha = eB_{\neg\,\alpha}$. Indeed, assume that $B_j \in eB_\alpha$. Then, for every valuation v on B_α,

$$v^{B_j \hookleftarrow 0} \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad v^{B_j \hookleftarrow 1} \nVdash_{\mathsf{c}} \alpha.$$

Hence,

$$v^{B_j \hookleftarrow 0} \Vdash_{\mathsf{c}} \neg\,\alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad v^{B_j \hookleftarrow 1} \nVdash_{\mathsf{c}} \neg\,\alpha.$$

taking into account v is also a valuation on $B_{\neg\,\alpha}$. So, $B_j \in eB_{\neg\,\alpha}$. Similarly, for the other inclusion.

A similar epistemic behaviour occurs for example for the operator M defined as an abbreviation of $\int \alpha > 0$. The intuitive meaning of $\mathsf{M}\alpha$ is that α is observable and possibly true. Since, $\mathsf{M}\alpha$ can be seen as a conjunction involving $\odot\,\alpha$, then, as a consequence of the previous discussion, it is immediate to extrapolate its behaviour with respect to the propositional connectives. On the other hand,

$$\nVdash (\mathsf{M}\alpha) \equiv (\mathsf{M}(\neg\,\alpha))$$

when α is a tautology. In fact, when α is a tautology, $\mathsf{M}\alpha$ holds but $\mathsf{M}(\neg\,\alpha)$ does not hold since although $\odot(\neg\,\alpha)$ holds we have $\int \neg\,\alpha = 0$. However, $\vDash (\mathsf{M}\alpha) \equiv (\mathsf{M}(\neg\,\alpha))$ when both α and $\neg\,\alpha$ are not tautologies.

8 Concluding remarks

Probabilistic reasoning about quantum observability was introduced into classical propositional logic by developing the logic PLQO. This logic keeps the classical propositional connectives and is a generalization of the work in [MS06], by reasoning about incompatibility of observables (in [MS06] all observables were assumed to be compatible).

The semantics of PLQO was given by quantum structures each one composed by a Hilbert space representing the quantum system together with a unit vector representing the current state plus the interpretation of each propositional symbol as a propositional quantum variable. The logic was axiomatized by relying on the decidable theory of real closed ordered fields

and shown to be strongly sound and weakly complete. Furthermore, PLQO was proved to be a conservative extension of classical propositional logic (modulo a suitable translation). The epistemic nature of the observability operator $\odot$ was discussed. Although $\odot$ satisfies at least in part some epistemic properties, it is of a different nature of other quantum-like epistemic operators, like for instance those in [BS10], defined for different purposes.

Concerning future work, it seems worthwhile to investigate other meta-properties of PLQO starting with decidability and complexity of the decision problem. We expect this complexity to be much lower than the complexity of RCOF theoremhood since we only need to recognize RCOF theorems of a very simple clausal form.

Strong completeness of the PLQO axiomatization is not possible because $\mathbb{R}$ is an Archimedean real closed ordered field which led to a non compact entailment. Relaxing the semantics may open the door to establishing strong completeness.

We intend to develop a Hoare-style calculus for quantum sequential programs inspired by [CMS06, CCFMS07]. The context will be very different from the one in [CS04, BS06, BS05, BS08, BKSZ15] since we intend to consider quantum observables.

Finally, it seems worthwhile to analyze the observability operator $\odot$ as an analog of the consistency operator in some paraconsistent and paracomplete logics [CCM07] and it seems interesting to bring observability knowledge to the (paraconsistent) logical language used in [AC10].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia by way of grant UID/MAT/04561/2013 to Centro de Matemática, Aplicações Fundamentais e Investigação Operacional of Universidade de Lisboa (CMAF-CIO), grant UID/FIS/00099/2013 to Centro Multidisciplinar de Astrofísica and grant UID/EEA/50008/2013 to Instituto de Telecomunicações.

References

[AC10] J. C. Agudelo and W. Carnielli. Paraconsistent machines and their relation to quantum computing. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 20(2):573–595, 2010.

[Ada98] E. W. Adams. *A Primer of Probability Logic*. CSLI, 1998.

[BHL07] P. Busch, T. Heinonen, and P. Lahti. Heisenberg uncertainty principle. *Physics Reports*, 452:155–176, 2007.

[BKSZ15] J. M. Bergfeld, K. Kishida, J. Sack, and S.g Zhong. Duality for the logic of quantum actions. *Studia Logica*, 103(4):781–805, 2015.

[BS05] A. Baltag and S. Smets. Complete axiomatizations for quantum actions. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 42(12):2267–2282, 2005.

[BS06] A. Baltag and S. Smets. LQP: the dynamic logic of quantum information. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(3):491–525, 2006.

[BS08] A. Baltag and S. Smets. A dynamic-logical perspective on quantum behavior. *Studia Logica*, 89(2):187–211, 2008.

[BS10] A. Baltag and S. Smets. Correlated knowledge: an epistemic-logic view on quantum entanglement. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 49(12):3005–3021, 2010.

[BvN36] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann. The logic of quantum mechanics. *Annals of Mathematics*, 37(4):823–843, 1936.

[CCFMS07] R. Chadha, L. Cruz-Filipe, P. Mateus, and A. Sernadas. Reasoning about probabilistic sequential programs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 379(1-2):142–165, 2007.

[CCM07] W. Carnielli, M. E. Coniglio, and J. Marcos. Logics of formal inconsistency. In D. Gabbay and F. Guenthner, editors, *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, volume 14, pages 1–93. Springer, 2007.

[CMS06] R. Chadha, P. Mateus, and A. Sernadas. Reasoning about states of probabilistic sequential programs. In *Computer Science Logic*, volume 4207 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 240–255. Springer, 2006.

[CS04] B. Coecke and S. Smets. The sasaki hook is not a [static] implicative connective but induces a backward [in time] dynamic one that assigns causes. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 43(7):1705–1736, 2004.

[Dir39] P. A. M. Dirac. A new notation for quantum mechanics. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 35:416–418, 1939.

[Dir67] P. A. M. Dirac. *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, (revised) fourth edition, 1967.

[EGL07] K. Engesser, D. Gabbay, and D. Lehmann, editors. *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures: Quantum Structures*. Elsevier, 2007.

[EGL09] K. Engesser, D. Gabbay, and D. Lehmann, editors. *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures: Quantum Logic*. Elsevier, 2009.

[Hal03] J. Y. Halpern. *Reasoning about Uncertainty*. MIT Press, 2003.

[Hal13] B. Hall. *Quantum Theory for Mathematicians*. Springer, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 2013.

[HS15] A. B. Henriques and A. Sernadas. Epistemic nature of quantum reasoning. Preprint, IST - U Lisboa, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal, 2015.

[Mar02] D. Marker. *Model Theory: An Introduction*, volume 217 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 2002.

[MS06] P. Mateus and A. Sernadas. Weakly complete axiomatization of exogenous quantum propositional logic. *Information and Computation*, 204(5):771–794, 2006.

[MvdH95] J.-J. Meyer and W. van der Hoeck. *Epistemic Logic for AI and Computer Science*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[Pir76] C. P. Piron. *Foundations of Quantum Physics*. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., 1976.

[SP07] B. Steinbach and C. Posthoff. An extended theory of boolean normal forms. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Statistics, Mathematics and Related Fields*, pages 1124–1139, 2007.

[SRS15] A. Sernadas, J. Rasga, and C. Sernadas. On probability and logic. Preprint, CMAF-CIO and IST - U Lisboa, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal, 2015. Submitted for publication.

[Tar51] A. Tarski. *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*. University of California Press, 1951. 2nd Edition.

[vdMP03] R. van der Meyden and M. K. Patra. A logic for probability in quantum systems. In *Computer Science Logic, 17th International Workshop, 12th Annual Conference of the EACSL, and 8th Kurt Gödel Colloquium*, volume 2803, pages 427–440. Springer, 2003.

[vN55] J. von Neumann. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, 1955. Translated from the German (1932).

[Zhe27] I. I. Zhegalkin. On the technique of calculating propositions in symbolic logic. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 1927.